

10/590873

IAP9 Rec'd PCT/PTO 25 AUG 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International File No. PCT/EP2005/050058

Re Item V.: Reasoned statement as defined in Rule 66.2(a)(ii)

1. Related art

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE-A 101 55 485; Robert Bosch GmbH; May 22, 2003

D2: EP-A-1 139 064; Siemens AG; October 4, 2001

D3: EP-A-1 209 445; Audi AG; May 29, 2002

2. Novelty - Article 33(2), PCT

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2), PCT because the object of Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 is not novel (Rule 64 (1)-(3), PCT) for the following reasons:

2.1 Independent Claim 1:

Document D1 (see, for example, column 3, paragraph 13 to column 7, paragraph 25 and Figures 1, 2) discloses a method for enabling navigation data (see title) which is stored on a data carrier (see, for example, column 4, paragraph 14). The user may enable the data for a freely selectable area (see, for example, column 5, paragraph 19 and columns 6 and 7, paragraph 25); i.e., the user may freely choose which of the regions that are stored on the data carrier he would like to enable. These are all the method steps of independent Claim 1, and the object of this claim therefore is not novel.

2.2 Dependent Claims 3, 5, and 6:

EV839762116

The features of Claims 3, 5, and 6 are likewise known from Document D1:

Claim 3: Transmission of the use authorization via a radio signal (see, for example, column 4, paragraph 17).

Claim 5: Time-limited enabling (see, for example, columns 5 and 6, paragraph 22).

Claim 6: The area is not limited to any political boundaries; i.e., multiple countries may be enabled by use of one key (see, for example, column 6, paragraphs 23 and 24).

2.3 Novelty with respect to Documents D2 and D3:

The object of Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 is likewise not novel with respect to Documents D2 (see, for example, column 1, paragraph 4 to column 4, paragraph 18; column 6, paragraph 27 to column 10, paragraph 40 and Figures 1 through 3) and D3 (see column 2, paragraph 8 to column 7, paragraph 35 and Figures 1, 2).

3. Inventive step - Article 33(3), PCT

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3), PCT because the object of Claims 2 and 4 is not based on an inventive step (Rule 65(1), (2), PCT) for the following reasons:

3.1 Dependent Claims 2 and 4:

Dependent Claims 2 and 4 disclose minor changes or additions to the method described in independent Claim 1 which are within the scope of what those skilled in the art would normally undertake based on customary considerations, and in particular the advantages thus achieved are readily anticipated. Consequently, the

object of Claims 2 and 4 is not based on an inventive step.

4. Determined deficiencies in the International Application

Independent Claim 1 is not written in the two-part form required by Rule 6.3 b), PCT.

Documents D1 through D3 are not cited in the Description section (Rule 5.1 (a)(ii), PCT).